[28th January 1929

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" May I know the reason why the consumption was low in 1921-22 and 1922-23 ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" If the hon. Member will read the two lines just below the figures given he will see that the figures for those years do not include the figures for the Agency tracts of the district. These were included under another category. Subsequently they were included for the years following."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know whether the Government are prepared to order the removal of arrack shops in the municipalities if the municipal councils concerned propose that step ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I have already said that no such proposals have come from the municipal councils. When proposals are received they will be considered."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know whether some municipal councils have not asked for the removal of toddy shops from their limits ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" There were I think one or two instances in which the municipal excise advisory committees recommended like that and orders were passed on them."

Medical

Alleged changes in the rules regarding L.M.P. course.

* 1036-A Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) the reasons for the promulgation of G.O. No. 1919, Public Health, dated 4th October 1927, to the effect, that even if the candidates for the Diploma of L.M.P. secured the required number of marks in the Board examination, they may be remanded after a scrutiny of the results of the class examination ;

(b) whether such a course is followed with regard to any other examination in the province ;

(c) whether four teachers in the Rayapuram Medical School have been asked to scrutinize the class marks of all the L.M.P. students in the province and to recommend candidates who may be declared to have passed ;

(d) whether the teacher members of the Board in the Rayapuram Medical School have condemned the Government Order and requested its withdrawal ;

(e) whether any, and if so, how many candidates have been declared to have failed in the examination because of deficiency in class marks only ; and

(f) whether the Surgeon-General recently proposed the abolition of the L.M.P. course and whether the Ministry turned it down, and if so for what reasons ?

A.—(a) The rules as they stood prior to the issue of the order referred to by the hon. Member required that every student should have passed all his class examinations before he could be permitted to appear for the Board examination. The Government considered that this restriction was a hardship to the students. They therefore decided to mitigate it; but, in order to ensure

28th January 1929]

that every successful candidate has been a steady worker and that no candidate who was below the average and who had an unsatisfactory school record was allowed to pass the Board examination by cramming just before the examination and managing to secure the minimum number of marks required for a pass, they gave discretion to the Board of Examiners to scrutinize the school records of candidates before deciding whether they should be declared to have passed or not in the examination.

The rules have since been further amended so as to make it clear

(1) that no candidate whose school record is not satisfactory shall be permitted to appear for the Board examination; and

(2) that, in assessing the marks to be allotted to each candidate, the Board may take into consideration his record in the Medical School as attested by the Superintendent and the marks obtained by him in the class examinations.

(*b*) It is understood that in the examinations conducted by the University of Madras the examiners take into consideration the practical work turned out by each student in class by referring to his class notes and records. The General Medical Council of Great Britain also recommends this procedure.

(*c*) No; the marks were tabulated by the President and scrutinized by the Board.

(*d*) Only one member protested against the order.

(*e*) Fifteen out of 754 candidates who appeared for the examination.

(*f*) The Surgeon-General recently suggested the appointment of a committee to examine and report on certain questions connected with the future of medical education in the Presidency. One of the questions was the need for a uniform minimum standard of medical education, which will be higher than the present L.M.P. standard. A committee has accordingly been appointed to examine the proposal.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" With reference to clause (*a*), may I ask the hon. the Minister to state whether the assessing of the marks is in the case of all students or only those students who have failed in the examination to enable them to get more marks by credit being given to the marks for work at school?"

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I think the assessing of the marks is in the case of all students, but previous records will be looked into."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" With reference to the answer to clause (*e*), may I know whether these 15 students are students who passed the examination and would have been declared to have passed the examination but for their pass marks in the examination being reduced by credit or discredit being given to them on account of their school marks being low?"

[28th January 1929

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" Unfortunately the hon Member for the University has not perused the order passed recently. The failure of the 15 students referred to in clause (e) has reference to the original order."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I take it therefore that according to the revised orders, any student who has passed the examination will not be declared to have passed the examination because of his school marks ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" Exactly so."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" Is the hon. the Minister aware, Sir, that in this case the Principal and the President are one and the same person ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" Will the hon. Member kindly repeat the question ? "

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" Is the hon. the Minister aware that in this case the Principal and the President are one and the same person ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" It is so."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" Is the hon. the Minister aware that the advantage intended to be given to such students as do not secure sufficient number of marks in the school examination is nullified by one and the same person being there ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" The Government presume that persons who are in charge of such institutions would act fairly and impartially."

Amendment to rules regarding the admission and training of L.M.P. candidates.

*1036-B Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY : With reference to the answer to clause (f) of question No. 389, answered on 8th October 1928, will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state whether the Government have withdrawn the amendment to rule 33 (c) of the rules for the admission and training of L.M.P. candidates ?

A.—The hon. Member is referred to the answer given to clause (a) of question No. 1036-A 345.

Public Health

Action taken on the recommendations of the Indian Delegation of the British Social Hygiene Council.

*1037-A Q.—Mr. C. GOPALA MENON : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether orders have been passed by the Government on the various recommendations contained in the report of the Indian Delegation of the British Social Hygiene Council on the subject of venereal diseases ;

(b) whether he will place the orders on the table of the House ;

(c) whether the Madras Branch of the Social Hygiene Council has formulated any programme of propaganda work and whether any application for grant for the purpose has been made to Government ; and

(d) whether the creation of mufassal committees of the Social Hygiene Council has been undertaken ?